



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES.

θηρ, LATIN *fera*, AND THE GREEK AND LATIN REPRESENTATIVES OF INDO-EUR. INITIAL PALATALS + *u*.

In all the more recent works treating of Greek and Latin philology we find *θηρ*, Latin *fera*, derived from an Indo-Eur. form with initial guttural, *ghēr-. So, for example, Brugmann, Grundriss I, pgs. 320, 325; Gustav Meyer, Gr. Gram.², pg. 204; Stolz, Lat. Gram.², §53. This view seems to owe its origin to the following words of J. Schmidt (K. Z. XXV, pg. 172): “*θηρ* und *ferus*, *fera* sind schon von Dobrowsky inst. p. 138 mit abulg. *zvěř* *fera* zusammengestellt; sie von einer grundform *dhvar* herzu-
leiten, wie Curtius no. 314 will, verbieten die slawischen lautgesetze. Ebensowenig ist es gestattet mit Fick II³ 167 aus aol. *φῆρ* und lat. *ferus* ein graecoitalisches *φepo-* wild zu construiren. Lit. *žvėrīs*, preuss. *swirins* acc. plur. haben als slawische lehnworte aus der discussion zu bleiben, denn das *z* des abulg. *zvěř* ist aus *dz*, der media zu *c* entstanden, wie nbulg. *dzvere* Miladin. bulg. *nar pėsni* No. 15 und die schreibungen der alten handschriften beweisen (zahlreiche belege in der werthvollen Abhandlung von Miklosich über die Schriftzeichen für *z* im IX bande des Rad jugosl. akad. und jetzt altslov. lautl.³ 252 f.) Ebenso ist das *θ* von *θηρ* durch das folgende gemeingriechische *η* aus ursprunglichem guttural umgewandelt.”

Of course the forms set up by Curtius and Fick are no longer even to be thought of. The only question is whether the initial was a guttural or palatal. The Lithuanian and Prussian forms, if not borrowed, would point conclusively to an initial palatal, and there is always a certain prejudice in favor of the genuineness of a word which occurs both in Prussian and in the earliest Lithuanian. Moreover, the Balto-Slavic family does not belong to the “labializing” group, and the presence of the *v* in *žvėrīs*, etc., seems unaccountable on the basis of an Indo-Eur. form *ghēr*-. The alleged parallels given by J. Schmidt, l. c. pg. 178, rest on too uncertain etymologies.

Now as to the main point. Do the forms of the Slavic branch

prove, as J. Schmidt maintains, that the initial was a guttural and consequently that the Baltic forms are borrowed? Not only does Slavic fail to prove this, but it actually proves the opposite.¹

I. The Bulgarian forms upon which J. Schmidt relies prove nothing. The modern Bulgarian *dzvere* is of no account, since the prefixing of a *d* sound in the pronunciation is a frequent dialectic occurrence before both *z* and *ž*. "Das *z* in einigen wörtern wird in manchem gegenden wie das poln. *dz* ausgesprochen, z. B. *zvêzda* (*dzvêzda*), *zêmù mî sù* (*dzêmù mî sù*), *zadnich* (*dzadnich*)" (Cankof, Gram. d. Bulg. Sprache, pg. 7; cf. also Miklosich, Vergleich. Gram. d. Slav. Sprachen, I², pg. 254). Only the first of these examples is a word with original guttural initial, the other two had palatal initials. Besides these cf. mod. Bulg. *dzvekna*, 'noise,' for *zvekna*, cited by Miklosich, Etymol. Wörterbuch der Slav. Sprachen, s. v. *zven*-.

Furthermore, the writing of the old MSS proves nothing in this case. It is true that both the Cyrillic and Glogolitic alphabets had different characters for *dz* and *z*, but even in the oldest documents they are occasionally confused, and the later the MS the more frequent are such mistakes. In the passage of Miklosich referred to by J. Schmidt (= Vergleich. Gram. I², pg. 252) we find *dzvěřī* cited from several Cyrillic MSS, the earliest being of the twelfth or thirteenth century. But on the previous page we note that the personal pronoun *azŭ* occurs in one of the old Glogolitic MSS in the form *adzŭ*. In face of the Avestan form *azem*, J. Schmidt would scarcely consider this spelling sufficient to prove that the original form had a guttural, not palatal, and that Lithuanian *asz*, Lettic *es*, Prussian *as* are borrowed from the Slavic. Instances like *adzŭ* are not rare (cf. Leskien, Handbuch d. altbulg. Sprache², §31, 3, at end), so that one cannot be too guarded in drawing conclusions from the writing of the MSS.

II. The Westslavic forms of the word directly prove that the initial was palatal, not guttural, that it is incorrect to derive *zvěřī* from **guērī*. Brugmann (Grundriss, I, pg. 342) refers to *zvěřī* as a parallel case to Old Bulgarian *cvisti*, 'to blossom,' which is derived from **kuīsti*. But the change of *k* to *c* does not occur in the Westslavic group (cf. Chechish *kvisti*, Old Polish *kwiść*, etc.), and that the corresponding change *g*-*dz* is likewise unknown to the Westslavic languages may be seen from Chechish *hvězda*,

¹ I am obliged to Prof. Leskien for assistance and confirmation in the judgment of the Slavic forms.

Polish gwiazda, Low Sorbian gvjezda, etc. = Old Bulgarian (d)zvězda, 'star' (cf. Leskien, Handbuch, §29, 4).

But the Westslavic cognates of zvěřī show a sibilant, not a guttural (cf. Chechish zvěř, Polish zwierz, Low Sorbian zvjeře), and thus exclude the possibility of deriving the word from *gwerī, Indo-Eur. *ghuēr-. The Indo-Eur. form must have been *ghuēr-, and the Baltic forms are restored to their rights.

It is evident now that we must either give up the comparison Old Bulgarian zvěřī = Gr. θήρ, Lat. fera, or explain the latter forms on a new basis. Let us first consider the Greek form. Can θήρ be derived from Indo-Eur. ghuēr? Unfortunately the material for determining what the Greek representatives of Indo-Eur. palatals + u are is very small. For ghū- and ghū there are no examples, for kū only one or possibly two certain ones, ἵππος = Skt. áçva-s, πᾶντ- = Skt. -çvant in ça-çvant- from sa-çvant (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, I, pg. 148, Griech. Gram.², pg. 32, where, moreover, Doric πᾶμα is derived from a form *kūā-men and Παυόχια from *kūano-). On these forms is based the law stated by Brugmann (Grundriss, pg. 292): "Aus kū entstand ππ, das im anlaut zu π vereinfacht wurde." I would rather set up the following rule, based on the treatment of k^u = Indo-Eur. guttural: *kū becomes ππ, initial π before o-vowels, liquids and nasal, both vocalic and consonantal, but ττ, initial τ before e- and i-vowels.*

I hold that kū and k^u fell together in prehistoric Greek, as far as the *quality* of the resulting sound is concerned. They differed only in *quantity*, kū as two full sounds giving a double consonant, while k^u, in which the u was only a slight after-tone, produced a single consonant; cf. ελιπον from *e-lik^u-o-m and ἵππος from *ekūo-s (Brugmann, Grundriss, I, pg. 315). Owing to the simplification of two initial consonants, the representatives of *initial* kū and k^u would become absolutely identical. As regards the treatment of gutturals before e- and i-vowels, I hold strongly to Brugmann's treatment of this phenomenon as against that of J. Schmidt. While the latter maintains that the Greek dentalization is identical with the Aryan palatization of gutturals, both having their beginnings in Indo-Eur., Brugmann holds that the two processes have no historical connection, that the dentals are due to a special Greek treatment of the gutturals, and, moreover, of those gutturals which originally had the u after-sound. That τ arose from k^u, not from k, he justly concludes from the fact that the dental occurs only in such classes of words for which

other forms in the labializing languages prove the former existence of k^u , e. g. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}o$ beside $\pi\acute{o}-\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\tau\acute{\iota}s$ = Lat. quis, and that the dentalization does not occur in words for which other forms show the representative of simple k (not k^u), as $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\eta s$ = Lat. celer (cf. Grundriss, I, pg. 316).¹

Now, just as k^u becomes τ before e - and i -vowels, so may $\hat{k}u$ have become $\tau\tau$, initial τ , under the same circumstances. This hypothesis can neither be proved nor disproved by actual examples. The only certain cases of $\hat{k}u$ - $\pi\pi$, initial π , are before o -vowels or vowel nasals, $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi o$ -s from $*\acute{e}k\hat{u}o$ -s and $\pi\alpha\nu\tau$ - from $*k\hat{u}\pi t$ -. To be sure, the etymology Gr. $\pi\phi\alpha\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon s$ = Skt. $p\acute{a}r\check{c}u$ (used in plural, meaning 'ribs'), has been proposed by Bechtel (Gött. Nachr. 1888, pg. 401) and supported by Johannson (Literaturblatt für germ. und rom. Phil., 1889, pg. 366), who sets up an Indo-Eur. form $*p\check{r}k\hat{u}i$, but, even according to the law as usually stated, we should expect $\pi\pi$, not π , so that the comparison is too uncertain to disturb us.

Once granted the correctness of the preceding hypothesis in regard to the treatment of $\hat{k}u$ and the rest is easy. Just as g^u becomes β before o -vowels, etc., and δ before e - and i -vowels, so would $\hat{g}u$ become $\beta\beta$, initial β , and $\delta\delta$, initial δ , respectively, under the same conditions. And as kh^u (Indo-Eur. gh) becomes ϕ before o -vowels, etc., but θ before e - and i -vowels, so would $\hat{k}hu$ (Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}hu$) become $\phi\phi$, initial ϕ , and $\theta\theta$, initial θ , respectively, and we have the explanation of $\theta\acute{\eta}\rho$. As Indo-Eur. $gheros$ (Skt. $h\acute{a}ras$), through the stage of prehistoric Gr. kh^ueros , becomes $\theta\acute{\epsilon}pos$, so would Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}hu\acute{e}r$ -, through the stage $khu\acute{e}r$, become $\theta\acute{\eta}\rho$.

Our next task is to explain Latin *ferus*, *fera*, on the basis of an Indo-Eur. $*\hat{g}hu\acute{e}r$ -. Italic k^u (= Indo-Eur. q) and $\hat{k}u$, both initial and in the interior of a word, are alike represented in Latin by qu -, irrespective of the quality of the following vowel; cf. *quo*-(Indo-Eur. $*qo$ -) and *equus* (Indo-Eur. $*ek\hat{u}o$ -s). It is held, however, that in the Italic period they were still distinct, because in Umbrian we find *ekvine*, a locative of an adj. = Lat. *equinus* (Iguvian Tables, II A. l. 13), while forms like *pumpe* = Lat. *quomque* show that Indo-Eur. q was labialized as in Greek (cf.

¹ Our argument is in no way affected by the setting up of these non-labialized gutturals as an independent Indo-Eur. series, cf. Osthoff, M. U. V, pg. 63, note; Bezzenberger in his *Beiträge* XVI, pg. 234 ff. For that the new series may in some cases be represented by dentals in Greek, as Bezzenberger claims, is not satisfactorily proved.

Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I, pg. 322). This conclusion is, however, uncertain owing to the possibility, which Brugmann l. c. has not omitted to note, that *ekvine* may be borrowed from the Latin, as *kvestur*, to which Bücheler (*Umbrica*, pg. 127) compares it, must necessarily be. Still the question whether *k^u* and *kū* had already in the Italic period become identical or not does not affect our argument either way; for *fera*, I believe, does not occur in any of the dialects, and we may restrict ourselves to Latin.

Like *k^u* and *kū*, so may *g^u* and *gū* have become identical in Latin, and, furthermore, *χ^u* (Indo-Eur. *gh*) and *χū* (Indo-Eur. *gh*; *χ*, adopted from Brugmann's *Grundriss*, is intended merely to denote the fact that the Indo-Eur. sonant aspirates had become surd spirants in the Italic period), just as Indo-Eur. **ghormo-* (Skt. *gharmá-s*) through the stage of **χ^uormo-s*, gives Latin *formus*, so would Indo-Eur. **ghuēr-*, through **χūēr-*, give Latin *fer-a*, *fer-us*.

A certain degree of support would be given to this hypothesis that Indo-Eur. *ghu* becomes *f* in Latin, if we could show that Indo-Eur. *gh* before vowel *u* becomes *f* in Latin, and this, I think, can at least be made probable. A change of *gh* to *f* beside that of *gh-h*, was formerly held for quite a number of words, but most of these have been put aside as borrowed from the Sabine dialect, where *f* is the regular representative of *gh*.

Only *fundo* remains a stumbling-block. No one ventures to consider such a common word as of Sabine origin, and the comparison with *χέω*, Gothic *giutan*, Anglo-Saxon *geotan* (English *gut*), Skt. *√hu*, 'to pour' (a libation), Avestan *zao-prā*, 'libation,' is too striking to be given up without a struggle.

Osthoff, to be sure, denies the correctness of the etymology (M. U. IV, pg. 99: "Indem ich . . . verwantschaft des lat. fundere mit griech. *χέω*, got. *giutan* leugne, entgehe ich einerseits der lästigen zumuthung, lat. lautwandel von *gh* in *f* neben demjenigen in *h* anzuerkennen"), but Brugmann (*Grundriss*, I, pg. 294, note) retains it while acknowledging the difficulty of explaining it. Under the supposition that *gh* before *u* becomes *f*, the difficulty is removed. As another example of this change may be cited *fulvus*, which Schrader (*Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*², pg. 168) considers to be of the same origin as *helvu-s*, which = O. H. G. *gelo*. A. S. *geolo* (English *yellow*), Skt. *hâri-s*, 'bright yellow,' Avestan *zairi-š*, 'golden,' Lith. *žėlti*, 'to grow green,' Old Bulg. *zelenŭ*, 'green.'

Helvu-s is from * χ el-vo-s, Indo-Eur. * \hat{g} hel-, fulvu-s from * χ ul-vo-s, Italic * χ ol-vo-s, Indo-Eur. * \hat{g} h_l-. The fact that fulvu-s and helvu-s are not identical in meaning in Latin is no argument against their formal relationship. "Gerade zur bezeichnung der dem bewusstsein erst allmählich aufgehenden farbenunterschiede sind der sprache lautdifferenzierungen sehr willkommen" (J. Schmidt, *Vokalismus*, pg. 353; the examples given to illustrate this are unfortunate, but the general truth of the statement is not to be doubted). The form folus (known only through Festus) = holus, Gr. $\chi\lambda\acute{o}\eta$, Lith. žolė, 'herbs,' 'vegetables,' may possibly owe its f to the analogy of fulvus, but it is scarcely likely that there existed any consciousness of the connection between the two words, and so it is better, with Brugmann, Osthoff, and others, to regard folus as a Sabine word which had crept into Festus.

Let us now see if there are any facts on the negative side at variance with our law. Are there any cases in which $\hat{g}h$ before u does *not* become f. Under the instances of Lat. h for Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}h$ given by Brugmann (*Grundriss*, pg. 294) we find humu-s, but here the u is not Indo-Eur., nor even Italic, but arose in Latin by Svarabhakti, like the e in Avestan zemō (monosyllabic, as is shown by the metre) gen. sing. = Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}hm$ -os (cf. Bartholomae, *Arische Forschungen*, II, pgs. 55, 56; Daniellson in Pauli's *Altital. Studien*, III, pg. 143). The u of Oscan hu[n]truis proves nothing, for in the Oscan alphabet u represents both ū and ō, and Umbrian hondra shows us that the u of hu[n]truis is for o.

It will be objected that though the u of fundo is Indo-Eur., the u of fulvu-s is not even Italic, but special Latin like the u of humus, and yet I have credited it with the power to change χ to f. True, but we can suppose that ol became ul at a period preceding that in which the Svarabhakti u in humu-s came into existence. That Italic ol = Indo-Eur. \hat{g} became ul in the very earliest period of Latin, long before the general weakening of o to u, is shown by the fact that forms with o are never found (cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*, pg. 238). To this very period then, after the change of -ol- -ul-, but before the appearance of the Svarabhakti u in humus, belongs the action of our law— χ (Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}h$) becomes f before u, otherwise h. Combining this with the results of our consideration of fera, we may state as a more general law—*Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}h$, Italic $\hat{\chi}$, becomes f in early Latin when followed by u either vowel or consonant (u or ū).*

CARL D. BUCK.